UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/696,558	10/25/2000	Jussi Ketonen	335.02	2721

7590 03/15/2004	EXAMINER

Michael J. Pollock
Limbach & Limbach L.L.P.
2001 Ferry Building
San Francisco, CA 94111

EXAMINER
NAJJAR, SALEH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2157	4

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 October 2000*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
         application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application)
since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet.
37 CFR 1.78.
    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific
reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: .

1.   This action is responsive to the application filed on October 25, 2000. Claims 1-

21 are pending. Claims 1-21 represent a method and system for an autonomous local

assistant for managing business processes.

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-3, 5-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Roberts et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,295,551.

Roberts teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a system and

method for conducting simultaneous voice and joint browsing sessions (see abstract).

As to claim 1, Roberts teaches a method of providing a client-side local assistant

system from an agent's computer system to a customer's computer system, the method

Comprising:

providing an agent Web site that presents a local assistant download

offer for servicing on the customer's computer system (see figs. 1-2; col. 7-10, Roberts

discloses a server 20 for providing downloadable plug-in in the form of an applet);

in response to selection by the customer's computer of a download link

for the local assistant download offer, invoking a server-side local assistant

administrative system installed on the agent's computer system such that the

local assistant administrative system transmits a local assistant installation

agreement to the customer's computer system (see col. 10-14, Roberts discloses that a

logon page is provided to the user to authenticate the user for downloading the plug-in);

in response to receipt by the agent's computer system of an accepted local

assistant installation agreement from the customer's computer system, installing a

client-side core local assistant system on the customers computer system (see col. 10-

12, Roberts discloses that a user applet or a sales representative applet is downloaded

to a computer in response to the logon request); and

in response to receipt by the agent's computer system of a request from the customer's computer system for a predefined functionality and information database associated with the core local assistant system, installing the predefined functionality and information database on the customer's computer system (see col. 9-10, Roberts discloses that a predefined functionality is requested and downloaded either before or after installation of the applet based on the client's applications or attributes).

Roberts fails to teach the limitation of a "rule set". Roberts does teach that a predefined functionality is requested and downloaded either before or after installation of the applet based on the client's applications or attributes, the applet is tailored to provide these functionalities when executed by the client (see col. 9-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Roberts by specifying the "functionality" as a "rule set" since the same functionality of allowing a plug-in to execute certain parameters is achieved.

As to claim 2, Roberts teaches the method as in claim 1, and wherein core local assistant system includes functionality that allows the customer's computer system to observe, analyze, and/or store information regarding a computer-mediated customer Interaction (see col. 12-18, Roberts discloses that the system is deployed in an environment to facilitate representative/customer interaction).

As to claim 3, Roberts teaches the method as in claim 2, and wherein the computer-mediated customer interaction comprises viewing a web page (see col. 10-12).

As to claim 5, Roberts teaches the method as in claim 1, wherein the core local assistant system includes functionality that allows the customer's computer system to define periodic tasks to be performed by the customers computer system (see col. 14-17, Roberts discloses that predefined events are scheduled and executed by the applet).

As to claim 6, Roberts teaches the method as in claim 5. and wherein the periodic tasks include gathering, analyzing and/or displaying information regarding

predefined topics of interest (see col. 9-10, Roberts discloses monitoring and reporting several factors at the customer's computer including historical links to web pages).

As to claim 7, Roberts teaches the method as in claim 1. and wherein the core local assistant system includes functionality that allows direct interaction between the core local assistant system and the customer (see figs. 1-7; col. 9-18, Roberts discloses that form fields are filled in the applet by the user to facilitate interaction).

Claims 8-9 do not teach or define any new limitations above claim 1 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

As to claims 10-11, Roberts teaches the computer-based system as in claim 9, and wherein the local assistant administrative system includes a merchant database that stores information relating to assisted merchants and subsequent to download of the predefined rule set and associated information database to the customer's computer system, selected portions of the merchant database are downloadable to the customer's computer system in accordance with rules included in the predefined rule set (see col. 11, Roberts discloses that a sales view page for example, can be downloaded to the sales representative's applet).

Claims 12-15 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 2-7 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

As to claim 16, Roberts teaches the computer-based system as in claim 8, and wherein the core local assistant system includes a rules interpreter system that creates and displays interactive windows related to the selected information (see col. 16-19, Roberts discloses that different windows can be provided to present different views).

As to claims 17-19, Roberts teaches the computer-based system as in claim 8. and wherein the core local assistant system includes a rules interpreter system that reads and writes local interaction data related to the selected information for storage on the customers computer system, includes a rules interpreter system that transmits requests to the local assistant administrative system for rule set updates, and wherein the core local assistant system includes a rules interpreter system that transmits requests to update interaction data relating to the selected information and stored in the local assistant administrative system (see figs. 1-7; col. 12-21).

As to claim 20, Roberts teaches the computer-based system as in claim 8, and wherein the core local assistant system includes a rules interpreter system that allows the customer's computer system to interact directly with the core local assistant system via browser navigation to a local reserved URL (see col. 12-18).

As to claim 21, Roberts teaches the computer-based system as in claim 20, and wherein the rules interpreter system includes functionality for parsing the local reserved URL to determine requested action and data to be determined by the customer's computer system (see col. 12-21).

4.   Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts further in view of Roberts et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,240,459.

Roberts teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a system and method for conducting simultaneous voice and joint browsing sessions (see abstract).

As to claim 4, Roberts teaches the method as in claim 2 above.

Roberts fails to teach the claimed limitation wherein the computer-mediated customer interaction comprises music.

However, Roberts 459' teaches a network delivery of interactive entertainment synchronized to playback of audio recordings (see abstract). Roberts 459' teaches a computer-mediated customer interaction comprising music (see col. 3-8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Roberts 551' in view of Roberts 459' so that the mediated customer interaction includes music. One would be motivated to do so to allow entertainment producers to deliver music content on the Internet.

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saleh Najjar whose telephone number is (703) 308-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:30 to 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Ario Etienne*, can be reached on (703) 308-7562. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-9052.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600. The fax number for the After-Final correspondence/amendment is (703) 746-7238. The fax number for official correspondence/amendment is (703) 746-7239. The fax number for Non-official draft correspondence/amendment is (703) 746-7240.

Saleh Najjar

Primary Examiner / Art Unit 2157